

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1-19 are amended. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Matthews III et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,025,837 (hereinafter "Matthews"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a service site server configured to provide a user OSD set menu and an OSD generation program which corresponds to original information of the TV, wherein the OSD generation program is configured to provide a plurality of language selections and a plurality of viewing and display processing formats. Matthews neither discloses nor suggests such features.

Matthews discloses an interactive entertainment system 20 connected to a centralized headend 22 through a network 32 which provides a pipeline for distribution of programs from the headend 22 to a subscriber, as well as a back channel to enable communication from the subscriber to the headend 22. A TV 28 coupled to a set top box (STB) 26 forms a user interface unit 24 which receives digital video signals from the headend 22 and controls the programs

displayed on the TV 28 based on a user request. An electronic programming guide (EPG), which is also received through interface unit 24, provides the user with a continuous listing of programs and related information.

The headend 22 includes a continuous media server 42, which distributes video data streams stored on a programs database 40, and an EPG server 44, which provides programming information stored in a program information database 46. An enhanced content server 52 provides the user with additional information on the video programs served by the continuous media server 42, such as interactive questions or games, additional trivia, advertising, merchandise and memorabilia, and web page access. While this enhanced content server 52 provides the user with the ability to access additional information regarding a particular program, and allows the user to expand his use of the EPG, it does not allow the user to make specific language, viewing format, or display processing format selections.

In contrast, the OSD generation program recited in claim 1 provides the user with not only a plurality of language selections, but also a plurality of viewing format selections and a plurality of display processing format selections. These features are not taught or suggested by Matthews. For example, the ability to adjust viewing format, which is related, for example, to the aspect ratio shown on the screen, as well as display processing format, which allows the TV to adapt to, for example, both NTSC and PAL formats, is clearly not taught or suggested by Matthews.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Matthews, and thus the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2-3 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

Independent claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, generating a user OSD which reflects a user selected language and user selected viewing and display processing formats corresponding to an operation order signal by accessing the OSD generation program when the operation order signal is input by a user. Matthews neither discloses nor suggests such features.

As discussed above, the interactive entertainment system and EPG with an enhanced content server taught by Matthews does not disclose or suggest providing the user with language format selections and viewing and display processing format selections. Thus, the system taught by Matthews could not generate an on screen display which reflects this information. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 11 is not anticipated by Matthews, and thus the rejection of independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Matthews should be withdrawn. Dependent claim 12 is allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 11, from which it depends, as well as for its added features.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 4-8, 9-11, and 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bril, U.S. Patent No. 5,946,051. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a service site server configured to provide a user OSD set menu and an OSD generation program which corresponds to original information of the TV, wherein the OSD generation program is configured to provide a plurality of language selections and a plurality of viewing and display processing formats. Bril neither discloses nor suggests such features.

Bril discloses a television system 100 which enables a user to access and view network application data and television signal display in parallel. In this system, a network interface 110 receives network application data. An OSD controller 170 stores this data in memory module 180 along with other display entities which provide additional television system 100 capabilities. A TV signal receiver 120 receives a television signal from an external source in a known format, and sends this signal to decoder 130, which encodes the signal into a digital signal. The OSD controller 170 then creates a unified display of the display entities stored in memory module 180 and the externally received television signal by overlaying all the display entities based on a priority scheme. Multiplexor 140 receives the encoded television signal and pixel data representing the overlay of surfaces stored in memory module 180 as inputs on lines 134 and 174, respectively, and selectively forwards one of the two inputs to display panel interface 145. As the pixel data elements correspond to the same point on the display screen, the selection is performed on a pixel by pixel basis, resulting in another overlay, and a unified display on the

screen. Thus, the multiplexor 140 and the OSD controller 170 for a selection circuit overlays the display entities displayed by the television system 100.

3 Bril teaches away from allowing a user to select from a plurality of viewing and display processing formats, as Bril specifically discloses that the television signal is transmitted and received in a known format (see column 6, lines 19-21). Thus, the display entities processed by Bril's OSD controller are clearly not viewing and display processing formats. Further, Bril's display entities are predetermined and Bril does not disclose or suggest a means whereby these entities can be altered based on user input.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Bril, and thus the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Bril should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2-10 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they ultimately depend, as well as for their added features.

Independent claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, generating a user OSD which reflects a user selected language and user selected viewing and display processing formats corresponding to an operation order signal by accessing the OSD generation program when the operation order signal is input by a user. Bril neither discloses nor suggests such features.

4 As discussed above, Bril actually teaches away from a plurality of viewing and display processing formats, and thus the television system as disclosed by Bril does not disclose or

suggest the ability to generate a user OSD which reflects a user selected language and user selected viewing and display processing formats.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 11 is not anticipated by Bril, and thus the rejection of independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Bril should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 13-17 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 11, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

Independent claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, a network interface unit configured to receive an OSD generation program which provides a user OSD set menu corresponding to original information of the TV, a plurality of language selections, and a plurality of viewing and display processing format selections from a service site server. Bril neither discloses nor suggests such features. As discussed above, Bril actually teaches away from an OSD which provides the user with a plurality of viewing and display processing formats, and thus the television system as disclosed by Bril does not disclose or suggest the claimed network interface unit and OSD generation program.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 18 is not anticipated by Bril, and thus the rejection of independent claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Bril should be withdrawn. Dependent claim 19 is allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 18, from which it depends, as well as for its added features.

ON Applicants note that the Examiner asserts Official Notice "in that providing a plurality of different modes of display and language selection is well known in the art, and it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art to at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Bril to provide language selection capabilities so that the user not only would access data network applications, but various language selection making the system more versatile and useful to the viewer." This Official Notice is respectfully traversed and production of a secondary reference to support such conclusions is respectfully requested. See MPEP § 2144.03(c)

The Examiner has provided no such reference or prior art which teaches these features, and the basis for this reasoning has not been explicitly set forth. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that, as set forth above, the asserted prior art references do not disclose or suggest these features in combination with the other claimed features, and Applicants further respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to modify the television system of Bril as suggested by the Examiner. In contrast to Bril, the claimed invention is capable of adapting to a user's particular language and viewing requirements.

II. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes


Serial No. 09/842,089
Amdt. dated November 26, 2003
Reply to Office Action of August 27, 2003

Docket No. P-221

would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Carol L. Druzbeck**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski
Registration No. 40,372
Carol L. Druzbeck
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 502-9440 CRW/CLD/JKM:jl
Date: November 26, 2003

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610